



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/672,454

09/26/2003

Daniel Huang-Yu Wu

02546.002400

9742

5514

7590

04/26/2005

FITZPATRICK CELLA HARPER & SCINTO
30 ROCKEFELLER PLAZA
NEW YORK, NY 10112

EXAMINER

KOYAMA, KUMIKO C

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2876

DATE MAILED: 04/26/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

✕

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/672,454	Applicant(s) WU ET AL.	
	Examiner Kumiko C. Koyama	Art Unit 2876	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 08 December 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|--|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>100804</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

1. Claims 7-10 and 12 are objected to because of the following informalities:

All abbreviated words should be fully spelled out to avoid indefiniteness. For example, "FTP" in claim 7 should be changed to --File Transfer Protocol (FTP)--.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 1-3, 5, 6, 9, 11 and 15-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Melen (US 6,426,806).

Re claims 1-3: Melen teaches a system and method for routing scanned documents with scanned control sheets. A document 104 and a control sheet 102 are fed into a scanner 106 (col 2, lines 19-21), which teaches receiving a document. When the scanner scans the control sheet 102, scanned control sheet information 108, which is an electronic image of the graphic information displayed by the control sheet, is produced and stored in the scan storage memory (col 2, lines 40-46). The scanned control sheet information is read out of the scan storage memory and interpreted by the OCR (col 2, lines 50-52). Such disclosure teaches scanning the

Art Unit: 2876

document, producing an electronic file representing the data contained in the document and extracting data from a document. The scanned control sheet information can be a machine readable information and such machine readable information can include a checksum information to verify the accuracy of the scanned control sheet information (col 2, lines 60-64 and col 8, lines 5-7). Such disclosure teaches a means for validating the data in the electronic file. Melen further teaches that the scanned control sheet information is tentative identifier (col 2, lines 64-65). The CPU compares the tentative identifier (or the scanned control sheet information) to the list of existing identifiers to determine whether any existing identifier matches tentative identifier (col 3, lines 13-20). Responsive to the verified tentative identifier matching an existing identifier, the system routes the scanned document information to a location associated with the matching existing identifier (col 4, lines 60-65 and col 8, lines 10-14).

Re claim 5 and 9: The OCR is means for converting the compliant data into a determined output filed format.

Re claim 6 and 11: Melen teaches a location 120 that includes a computer file folder, a computer file directory and an entry in a database linking the location to information necessary to retrieve the scanned document information (col 3, lines 12-16).

Re claim 15, 18, 19 and 23: Melen teaches a system and method for routing scanned documents with scanned control sheets. A document 104 and a control sheet 102 are fed into a scanner 106 (col 2, lines 19-21), which teaches receiving a document. When the scanner scans the control sheet 102, scanned control sheet information 108, which is an electronic image of the graphic information displayed by the control sheet, is produced and stored in the scan storage memory (col 2, lines 40-46). The scanned control sheet information is read out of the scan

Art Unit: 2876

storage memory and interpreted by the OCR (col 2, lines 50-52). Such disclosure teaches scanning the document, producing an electronic file representing the data contained in the document and extracting data from a document. The scanned control sheet information can be a machine readable information and such machine readable information can include a checksum information to verify the accuracy of the scanned control sheet information (col 2, lines 60-64 and col 8, lines 5-7). Such disclosure teaches a means for validating the data in the electronic file. Melen further teaches that the scanned control sheet information is tentative identifier (col 2, lines 64-65). The CPU compares the tentative identifier (or the scanned control sheet information) to the list of existing identifiers to determine whether any existing identifier matches tentative identifier (col 3, lines 13-20). Such disclosure teaches means for determining information relating to the transaction at one of the stages. Responsive to the verified tentative identifier matching an existing identifier, the system routes the scanned document information to a location associated with the matching existing identifier (col 4, lines 60-65 and col 8, lines 10-14). CPU 114 then transfers 228 scanned document information 110 to the location 120 associated with document identifier 126 (col 4, lines 1-5). Such disclosure teaches reporting the transaction information.

Re claim 16 and 17: Melen further teaches that otherwise, a fuzzy matching method is used 214 to determine whether any existing identifier 118 is similar enough to tentative identifier 124 to be considered a match. Fuzzy matching encompasses all non-literal matching methods (col 3, lines 20-26). Such disclosure teaches recovering from a transaction having a status identified as failed.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Melen in view of Gillings et al (US 5,666,490). The teachings of Melen have been discussed above.

Melen fails to teach means for rejecting noncompliant data and sending a notification of the same to a predetermined address.

Gillings discloses computer network system and method for managing documents. Gillings discloses that the CRF packet information is used to verify pages which are received from each protocol. After each page of a document is scanned, the index process compares the index information against the CRF packet definition to determine if the page received is a valid page. If the index information for a document is invalid, the system will reject the document and notify the user (col 9, lines 27-34).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to an artisan of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to integrate the teachings of Gillings to the teachings of Melen in order to indicate that there is an errors in the document data to ensure that all the document data is corrected inputted and scanned into the system, such that the errors is not carried out through the remaining of the process, which is further cause errors and invalid data storage.

6. Claims 7 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Melen in view of Clarkson et al (US 5,235,433). The teachings of Melen have been discussed above.

Art Unit: 2876

Melen fails to teach that the document is obtained from an e-mail, a facsimile, or a file transferred by FTP.

Clarkson teaches an image managed document which is received from a facsimile (col 3 and lines 14-17 and col 7, lines 20-35). Clarkson also teaches phone line 2 shown in Fig. 2.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to an artisan of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to integrate the teachings of Clarkson to the teachings of Melen in order to remotely receive a document data, such that a copy of the document is quickly received from a distant location.

7. Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Melen in view of Rudak (US 5,014,329). The teachings of Melen have been discussed above.

Melen fails to teach that the output file format is one of ASCII text, ANSI X.12, EDIFACT, XML, EANCOM, TRADACOMS, ODETTE, and a customer-specified format.

Rudak teaches that an electronic image of the text is processed by the OCR algorithm, where the characters of interest are converted to ASCII data (col 1, lines 44-46).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to an artisan of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to integrate the teachings of Rudak to the teachings of Melen such that the document can be easily edited and displayed by a computer to further update the document to date.

8. Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Melen in view of Wing (US 6,650,440). The teachings of Melen have been discussed above.

Melen fails to teach that the routing means utilizes a message transport protocol selected from the list consisting of HTTP, SMTP, and FTP or secured variants thereof.

Art Unit: 2876

Wing teaches a Simple Mail Transfer Protocol (SMTP) servers for routing e-mail to and from different computer networks (col 8, lines 50-52).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to an artisan of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to integrate the teachings of Wing to the teachings of Melen in order to route the document data to a remote location where there is a larger capacity database, such that all the document data in the same routing location are combine in one database to help the organization.

9. Claim 13 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Melen in view of Ett (US 5,227,893). The teachings of Melen have been discussed above.

Melen fails to teach means for generating billing records.

Ett teaches a pseudo-bar code control of image transmission utilizing in a trucking company that generates or receives from the shipper several forms such as bills of lading (col 8, lines 52-55).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to an artisan of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to integrate the teachings of Ett to the teachings of Melen in order to utilize Melen's system in various different environments and business to widen the use to increase users and buyers of the products or system.

10. Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Melen in view of Bobo, II (US 5,870,549). The teachings of Melen have been discussed above.

Melen fails to teach that means for querying the archive database.

Bobo teaches means for receiving requests in the form of a search query and the search query if forwarded to an application for conducting the search of the database (Abstract).

Art Unit: 2876

Therefore, it would have been obvious to an artisan of ordinary skill in the art at the time, the invention was made to integrate the teachings of Bobo to the teachings of Melen in order to quickly locate a document within a database to retrieve the document for display or update the document.

Conclusion

11. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Moore, U.S. Patent Applicant Publication No. 2003/0042319, discloses an automatic and semi-automatic index generation for raster documents.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kumiko C. Koyama whose telephone number is 571-272-2394. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8am-4:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael G. Lee can be reached on 571-272-2398. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2876

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


Kumiko C. Koyama
April 21, 2005


DIANE I. LEE
PRIMARY EXAMINER